



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—PARALLEL FEATURES IN THE TWO SANSKRIT EPICS.

The most striking parallels in the Hindu epics are found in the phraseology of peaceful scenes, though identical phrases of battle are more frequent. Between these two classes stand a few colloquialisms and short descriptive phrases which are almost or quite the same in both epics. Thus, in Mahābhārata xv. 23. 8 we read

pāṇḍureṇā 'tapatreṇa dhriyamāṇena mūrdhani,

a phrase repeated in v. 178. 77. In Rāmāyaṇa iv. 38. 31,

pāṇḍarenā 'tapatreṇa dhriyamāṇena mūrdhani

shows only a slight variation in B., and this vanishes in C., the Bombay text.¹ In like manner the verse Mbh. vi. 97. 33,

kāñcanoṣṇīṣiṇas tatra vetrajharjharapāṇayaḥ,

is almost identical with R. vi. 99. 23 :

kañcukoṣṇīṣiṇas tatra vetrajharjharapāṇayaḥ ;

and the following words, *protsāhayantaḥ śanakāiḥ* in Mbh., *utsārayantaḥ sahasā* in R., look like a conscious variation in the second hemistich. As an example of the colloquial *pāda* may be taken *no 'tkaṇṭhāṁ kartum arhasi*, a phrase found both in Mbh. iii. 216. 10; xii. 170. 11, etc., and in R. v. 36. 76. Here, too, belong the cases of colloquial didacticism which abound in both epics. A long proverb, for instance, is given from the Rāmāyaṇa in the Petersburg Lexicon under the word *kṛtaghna*, but the Mahābhārata, though it is not credited with the word, has at xii. 172. 25–26 both the same word and the same proverb :

*brahmaghne ca surāṇi ca cāure bhagnavrate tathā
niṣkṛtīr vihitā rājan kṛtaghne nā 'sti niṣkṛtīḥ
mitradrohi kṛtaghnaḥ ca nṛṣaṅsaḥ ca narādhamāḥ
kravyādāḥ kṛmibhiḥ cāi 'va na bhujyante hi tādṛṣāḥ*

This quotation is introduced with the words *kravyādā api rājendra*

¹ My references are to B., the Gorresio text, unless otherwise indicated.

kṛtaghnān no 'pabhuñjate. In the Rāmāyaṇa one verse of the two is cited as a *brahmaṇā gītaḥ ślokaḥ* in iv. 34. 17, while the introductory verse of the Mahābhārata is found in another form in another section, iv. 30. 13: *tān mṛtān api kravyādāḥ kṛtaghnān no 'pabhuñjate*. As the abstract of this word is cited only from later literature, I may add that *kṛtaghnatā* is also found in the Mahābhārata, xii. 133. 16.

That a careful consideration of such parallels in the two epics will add very much to our knowledge of their mutual relations is perhaps too much to expect, but that something may be gained by studying epic phraseology as a whole is a fact easily illustrated. Professor Jacobi says in his *Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 97: "Dem Dichter des Rāmāyaṇa, oder denjenigen, bei denen die Rāma-sage sich bildete, scheint sie [die Seeschiffahrt] entweder gänzlich unbekannt oder doch etwas so wenig bekanntes gewesen zu sein, dass nicht einmal der Gedanke auftauchte, den Rāma nach Laṅkā mit Schiffen übersetzen zu lassen." To this surprising statement is added a note which, while it admits that the Rāmāyaṇa often speaks of ships, yet maintains that we must generally understand river-shipping to have been intended; while the last clause of this note reasserts by implication the position maintained in the text: "Vielleicht bestand schon Flussschiffahrt; aber von ihr zur Seeschiffahrt ist noch ein grosser Schritt." Since shipwreck is alluded to as early as the Vedic period,¹ this last admission is not a very generous one, but there seems to me to be error in the whole argument. The *vyathitā senā mūḍhavāte 'va nāur jale* of C. 50. 1 implies the same ocean as is expressed in B. vi. 25. 1, *senā bhinnā nāur iva sāgare*; while there is no varied reading to take refuge in for the ocean-faring ship of v. 28. 8:

mahārṇave nāur iva vātāmūḍhā;

and C. v. 25. 14 = B. 26. 12:

samudramadhye nāuḥ pūrṇā tādṛitā mārutāir yathā,

for here in C. the change is only *vāyuvagair ivā 'hatā*. In all these passages the same image is before the poet of the Rāmāyaṇa as before the Mahābhāratakr̥t when he speaks of the *nāur bhinnā* (or *bhagnā*) *agādhe* of merchants, in ix. 3. 5. The reason why Vālmiki employs the device of a bridge is that the legend existed before the poet and the rocks were there to prove (as

¹ AV. v. 19. 8: *nāvaṁ bhinnam ivo' dakam*.

they prove to the natives to-day) the correctness of the tradition. No wise poet ignores such tradition, and that Vālmiki utilizes it while he alludes to ships wrecked "in mid-ocean" shows, as I think, that he was acquainted not only with 'Seeschiffahrt,' but also with local tradition.

Formulae sometimes pass from scenes of peace to those of war, proving that they were fixed as formulae rather than as adjuncts of any particular action. Thus, in Mbh. vi. 59. 66 there is battle-action and men see the great warrior plunging between two armies "emitting showers of darts without stopping," and *pratapantam ivā 'dityam* (ib. vi. 106. 80: *ivā 'dityam pratapantam svatejasā*). But in R. ii. 117. 16, there is a scene of peace: "May the guilds, great king, and all the chief men (of the city) see thee standing in thy kingdom *pratapantam ivā 'dityam*." ¹

It is sometimes a matter of indifference which end of a phrase comes first. The Mbh. form *ṣaravarṣāṇi srjantam*, given in the last note, appears in R. vi. 18. 36, for instance, as *srjantam ṣaravarṣāṇi* (not in C.). But usually the same order obtains. Thus in Mbh. vi. 47. 20 and 67 and R. vi. 32. 28, *vavarṣa ṣaravarṣāṇi*.

The phraseology of battle is practically the same in both epics, and it is quite surprising that special critics of the epics have not emphasized this fact, as it is a matter of some moment.² I have here collected a few examples to illustrate this point, chiefly from the sixth book of each epic. Every reader of the epics must have noticed how the same phrase repeats itself not only in one epic, but in both. Sometimes these are almost identical, as in *vīro raṇaviṣāradaḥ* of Mbh. vi. 57. 16, compared with *raṇe raṇaviṣāradaḥ* of R. vi. 60. 4; or *karma kurvāṇam duṣkaram* of Mbh. vi. 105. 6, compared with *kṛtaṁ karma suduṣkaram* of R. vi. 46. 43; *raṇe karma suduṣkaram* and *kṛtvā k. s.*, ib. 55. 36 and 65. But though there is not (as in C.) absolute identity, the virtual oneness of

pūrṇāyatavisr̥ṣṭena ṣareṇā 'nataparvaṇā, Mbh. vi. 95. 72,
and *karmāyatavisr̥ṣṭena ṣareṇā 'nataparvaṇā*, R. B. vi. 51. 75,

can scarcely be doubted, and the question arises whether one is

¹ The phrase in the Mbh. version, *ṣaravarṣāṇi srjantam aniṣaṁ yudhi*, is also common. Compare the whole repeated hemistich in Mbh. vi. 106. 53. The word *aniṣa* is ascribed in the Lexicon only to R. and later literature.

² Professor Jacobi, loc. cit., p. 77, note, cites two "stehende Ausdrücke," but does not discuss the matter.

taken from the other, or whether each belongs to a common stock of older epic phraseology. Though the shorter parallels are not so striking, they must nevertheless be taken into account, and to my thinking they must be explained like the longer; but for the present I will waive all discussion of this question.

Of these shorter resemblances there are not a few, and they are strewn over the whole epic. Thus, *vivṛādha niṣītāiḥ ṣarāiḥ* is a constant phrase, e. g. Mbh. vi. 45. 77; R. vi. 19. 55. The same phrase is expanded, *vivṛādha niṣītāiḥ tṛkṣṇāiḥ ṣarāiḥ kanakabhūṣaṇāiḥ*, in Mbh. vi. 64. 15; to which comes like an echo R. vi. 18. 45, *ṣarāiḥ kanakabhūṣaṇāiḥ* in B., where C. has *kāñcana-bhūṣaṇāiḥ*, though the same phrase occurs in R. vi. 51. 38, where B.'s *kanaka*^o is also found in C. Variations on the *niṣītāiḥ ṣarāiḥ* phrase are numerous. R. vi. 28. 4 has *niṣītāiḥ ṣarāiḥ . . . kañkapatrāir ajihmagāiḥ*; Mbh. vi. 48. 68 has *kañkapatrāiḥ ṣītāiḥ ṣarāiḥ*. Then, with the substitution of synonyms, we find *vivṛādha niṣītāir bāṇāiḥ*, Mbh. vi. 59. 61, or *cicheda niṣītāir bāṇāiḥ*, Mbh. vi. 45. 23. In the last we have *prahasann iva*, as in R. i. 41. 3. Compare Mbh. vi. 47. 14, *nr̥tyann iva*, or R. vi. 55. 12, *hasann iva*, all current phrases. The form *niṣītāiḥ ṣarāiḥ* generally ends a *pāda*, as in Mbh. (above and) vii. 115. 7; R. vi. 28. 4; but is sometimes inverted, *cicheda bāṇāir niṣītāiḥ supatrāiḥ*, R. vi. 36. 75, for the metre.

Another of these stock phrases which every one must have noticed in both epics is *tam (tām) āpatantam sahasā*, e. g. in Mbh. vi. 116. 50 and 57; when feminine, usually a club or spear "resembling Yama's rod." Thus Mbh. vi. 116. 49: *cikṣepa gadāṁ yama-daṇḍopamāṁ raṇe*,¹ *tām āpatantīm sahasā*, etc.; while in R. vi. 36. 10-12 *yama-daṇḍakalpa* follows as an epithet of the arrows, after *tam āpatantam sahasā*. The first two words occur too often to count; e. g. Mbh. vi. 49. 28; 62. 36; R. vi. 28. 35. The phrase is applied to an army corps in Mbh. vi. 95. 83, *tām āpatantīm sahasā . . . mahācamūm abhidudrāva vegena*. Here, as in many other cases, one phrase runs into another: *abhidudrāva vegena* is a constant support to the poet, who leans upon it whenever his wit wearies, as in Mbh. vi. 100. 49; 104. 34-35; R. vi. 55. 43, 47. A stock phrase is also *sa viṣphārya mahac cāpam*, e. g. Mbh. vi. 49. 26; 95. 70; R. vi. 51. 5. Like *vegena*, which rounds off a phrase, as above or in *pātayāmāsa vegena*, is *vīrya-*

¹ This phrase also in Mbh. vi. 94. 22, and often; *kāladāṇḍopamāṁ raṇe*, ib. vi. 45. 8 (32 has a v. l.).

vān,¹ a very useful space-filler. It occurs in a characteristic group of similar but not quite identical phrases :

gadām ādāya vīryavān, Mbh. ix. 55. 24.

gadām udyamya vīryavān, Mbh. ix. 33. 37.

dhanur ādāya vīryavān, R. vi. 36. 7; 38. 1; 73. 17.

(Compare R. vi. 87. 20; 88. 2; 91. 10; and 49. 18.)

The passage Mbh. vi. 111. 27 ff. gives a capital illustration of the hand-work in some of the battle-scenes, which are almost as mechanical as Homer's, and shows how the two Hindu epics correspond in respect of phraseology. The few verses from vs. 27 to the end of the chapter are replete with epic iterata: *taṭrā 'dbhūtam apaścāyāma* (a Mbh. phrase²); *ājaghāna śarāis tūrṇam*; so *'nyat karmukam ādāya*; *ājaghāno 'rasi kruddhaḥ* (repeated three times in this passage alone and current elsewhere, e. g. Mbh. vi. 61. 36; R. vi. 55. 20); *tayor yuddham samabhavad ghorarūpam*; *tiṣṭha tiṣṭhe 'ti cā 'bravīt* (41, 45)³; *vīryādha niçitāis tikṣṇāiḥ kaṅkapatrāir ajihmagāiḥ*.⁴ In 38, *ājaghāno 'rasi kruddhaḥ*, one common phrase, is joined to another, *śareṇā 'nataparvanā*, almost as frequent. The next verse ends in the well-beloved space-filler, *raṇamūrdhani* (Mbh. vi. 103. 12; R. vi. 50. 55; 55. 68). The word *māriṣa* used in this passage is, I think, as a terminal peculiar to the Mahābhārata. In the Mahābhārata it occurs as here, vi. 111. 51, hundreds of times, merely to fill up. Such terminals are generally common to both epics. Thus, *paravīrahā*, Mbh. vi. 116. 49; R. vi. 36. 53 (and often elsewhere); *tejasā*, in the phrase *āditya iva tejasā*, e. g. N. 1. 2; R. vi. 29. 4, and as mere terminal, quite current, *jvalantam iva tejasā*, *pradīptam iva tejasā*, R. vi. 51. 73; 46. 87, etc.

The collocation of two set phrases, to which I have just alluded, is very usual. Thus, the phrase cited above, *ājaghāno 'rasi*

¹ Sometimes the two are combined, as in R. vi. 36. 44: *pātayāmāsa vegena ... vīryavān*.

² Not in R. (on account of the conditions of narration).

³ This *tiṣṭha tiṣṭhe 'ti cā 'bravīt* occurs over and over again, e. g. Mbh. vi. 54. 72; 116. 22 (and often); R. vi. 58. 47. It is united with *abhidudrāva vegena* (text above) in Mbh. vi. 101. 9.

⁴ Frequent close of a verse, Mbh. vi. 103. 11; compare above, R. vi. 28. 4. Another formula is *rukmapuṅkhāir ajihmagāiḥ*, Mbh. vi. 114. 11; R. vi. 20. 26; joined with the common phrase *vīryādhur niçitāir bāṇaiḥ* in the former case. It either begins or ends a verse, as in R., loc. cit., and vi. 19. 63, respectively.

kruddhaḥ, is very common, and so is *bhallāiḥ sannataparvabhīḥ*. The two make a hemistich in Mbh. vi. 114. 26; while in 104. 14 the equally common turn, *ṣarāiḥ sannataparvabhīḥ* (cf. 47. 5; 101. 21, etc.), is united with *chādayāmāsa samare*, which is also a frequent expression. The fact is that the epic to a great extent is made up not of *ślokas* but of *pādas*. The *pāda* is something complete in itself, a block to build with, to fit in beside other such blocks squared to it in advance. Of whole words making such blocks the epic style (for in this regard there is no difference between the style of the Mahābhārata and that of the Rāmāyaṇa) preserves a sufficient number. As familiar examples may serve *palāyanaparāyaṇaḥ*, Mbh. vii. 103. 32; R. v. 33. 31; and *parasparajighāṃsavaḥ*, Mbh. vi. 46. 5, 15, etc.; R. vi. 29. 16 (or *ghāṇsayā*, ib. 55. 24, etc., sometimes only as v. l. in one edition).¹

From the language of battle-scenes a large number of *pāda*-filling phrases common to both epics might easily be collected, but I will cite here only a few examples illustrative of different situations.

avaplutya rathāt tūrṇam, R. vi. 18. 47.

avatīrya rathāt tūrṇam, R. vi. 36. 87.

avaplutya rathāt tūrṇam, Mbh. vi. 94. 22; 96. 39.

avatīrya rathād ārttaḥ, Mbh. vii. 3. 8.

avatīrya rathottamāt, Mbh. iii. 43. 16.

rathād avaplutya tataḥ, Mbh. vi. 59. 99, etc.²

agamayad yamasādanam, Mbh. vi. 54. 77.

anayad yamasādanam, ib. 81; R. iii. 34. 31.

nayāmi yamasādanam, R. iii. 28. 4; vi. 20. 14, 17.

nayīṣyati yamālayam, R. vi. 36. 42.

¹ Close resemblance without actual touch occurs at times. One of the best examples is that of the two Rākṣasas, who are spoken of as *prabhinnāv iva mātāṅgāu*, and are said to be *parasparavadhāiṣiṇāu* in R. vi. 69. 1, compared with the two Asuras of Mbh. i. 210. 19, who are described as *vadhāiṣiṇāu prabhinnakaraṭāu mattāu bhūtvā kuñjararūpiṇāu*. In the latter case the demons become what in the former they resemble. Compare R. i. 13. 17.

² In Mbh. this is the preferred order. Another stop-gap is found in R. vi. 46. 9, where *vira* ends this phrase: *so 'vaplutya rathād viraḥ*. It occurs often at the end of another phrase, *etasminn antare*, which is found everywhere and is filled out with *viraḥ*, *tatra*, or some such word. Mbh. vi. 48. 96; 74. 36 (*eva kāle tu*); R. vi. 25. 8; 36. 99; 72. 60; etc. Here colloquial language first furnishes the block, which has to be filled out to the size of the octosyllabic *pāda*.

prāhiṇod yamasādanam, Mbh. vi. 103. 17.

prāhiṇon mṛtyulokāya, Mbh. vi. 54. 82; 113. 15.

anayan paralokāya, Mbh. vi. 103. 18.

yiyaśur yamasādanam, Mbh. i. 163. 10 and R. vi. 57. 23.¹

tasya tad vacanaṁ śrutvā, Mbh. ix. 65. 21; R. vi. 37. 21.

etat tu vacanaṁ śrutvā, R. vi. 27. 6.

etac chrutvā tu vacanam, Mbh. vi. 48. 98.²

hanta te 'haṁ pravakṣyāmi, Mbh. vi. 101. 5.

hanta te sampravakṣyāmi, R. vi. 3. 1. Compare R. i. 49. 14.

siṅhanādāṅḥ ca kurvatām, R. vi. 32. 13; 54. 39.

siṅhanādāṅḥ ca kurvantaḥ, Mbh. vi. 64. 84.

siṅhavad vinadan muhuḥ, Mbh. vi. 91. 10, etc.³

nedus te siṅhavad, R. vi. 58. 7.

vinadya jalado yathā, Mbh. vi. 49. 35.

vineduḥ . . . jaladā iva, R. vi. 21. 22.

Before passing on to other similes, to which the last quotation naturally brings us, it is worth while to compare the various turns given to one of the commonest phrases of battle in both epics, the 'tumult' description, which ordinarily intervenes between the more carefully described actions of individual heroes. In its simplest and usual form it appears as

babhūva tumulaḥ śabdaḥ,

which is found, for instance, in Mbh. vi. 56. 22 and R. vi. 32. 13; or, as in Mbh. vi. 119. 19 and R. vi. 19. 4 respectively,

ity āsīt tumulaḥ śabdaḥ

ity evaṁ tumulaḥ śabdaḥ

¹ Analogous are *anayat pretarājasya sādanam*, Mbh. vi. 104. 1; *gamitāḥ* (and *jagmus te*) *paralokāya*, ib. 115. 4; 116. 76; *vyaktāṁ vā yamasādanam*, R. vi. 68. 11.

² More of these phrases are scarcely worth recording, as they belong to the language of scarcely differentiated prose. The following are found passim in both epics: *tasyāi 'tad vacanaṁ śrutvā*; *tasya tad vacanaṁ śrutvā*; *idaṁ vacanam abravīt*. Perhaps the commonest is the last with its variants, *vacanaṁ ce 'dam abravīt*, *tato vacanam abravīt*, e. g. Mbh. v. 178. 27; R. ii. 16. 23; vi. 36. 33; 41. 1; and *evam uktaḥ pratyuvāca*, or *tathe 'ty uktvā*, as in Mbh. vi. 59. 47; vii. 202. 70; R. vi. 36. 102.

³ The last word is often repeated at the end of a *pāda*, as in Mbh. vi. 112. 8: *vyāharanti muhur muhuḥ*; R. vi. 18. 45; 51. 35, etc.: *nanāda ca muhur muhuḥ*; ib. 55. 21: *cacāla ca muhur muhuḥ*.

Other forms of the phrase are:

- sañjajñe tumulaḥ śabdaḥ*, Mbh. vi. 46. 17.
tumulañ yuddhañ sañjajñe, R. vi. 28. 2.
 . . . *tumulañ samapadyata*, Mbh. vi. 70. 4.
sutumulaḥ . . . sañgrāmaḥ samapadyata, R. vi. 28. 9.
tatrā 'sīt sumahad yuddhañ tumulañ lomaharṣaṇam, Mbh.
 vi. 58. 13; R. vi. 18. 23.
tad babhūvā 'dbhutañ yuddhañ tumulañ lomaharṣaṇam, R.
 iii. 31. 44. Compare Jacobi, loc. cit., p. 73.
tasmīn tu tumule yuddhe vartamāne mahābhaye, Mbh. vi.
 44. 30.
tasmīn ākulaśaṅgrāme vartamāne mahābhaye (and also)
tasmīn mahābhaye ghore tumule lomaharṣaṇe, Mbh. vi. 70.
 3, 13.
vartamāne tathā ghore sañgrāme lomaharṣaṇe, R. vi. 19. 13.

But perhaps the most striking similarities are to be found in the similes:

- śalabhā iva pāvakaḥ*, Mbh. viii. 24. 61.
śalabhān iva pāvakaḥ, R. vi. 44. 38.
jīmūta iva bhāskaram, Mbh. vi. 64. 44.
jīmūtam iva bhāskaraḥ, R. vi. 21. 43.
pāśahastam ivā 'ntakam, Mbh. vi. 109. 11; R. iii. 43. 33.
pāśahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ, R. vi. 39. 30.
pāśahasto yathā yamaḥ, R. vi. 46. 36.
daṇḍapāñir ivā 'ntakaḥ, Mbh. vi. 48. 90; 62. 55.
pātayāmāsa samare¹ daṇḍahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ, Mbh. vi. 102. 36.
daṇḍahasta ivā 'ntakaḥ, R. vi. 65. 25.
totrāir iva mahādvīpam, Mbh. vi. 101. 13.
totrāir iva mahādvīpam, R. iii. 34. 10.
totrāir iva mahāgajam, Mbh. vi. 111. 7.
totrā 'rdita iva dvīpaḥ, Mbh. vi. 54. 69 and R. ii. 39. 43.
śaravarṣeṇa . . . parjanya iva vṛṣṭimān, Mbh. vi. 63. 25.
bāñāughāñ . . . parjanya iva vṛṣṭibhiḥ, R. vi. 54. 34.

¹ A phrase found passim. So *tāḍayāmāsa samare*, prefixed to Mbh. vi. 111. 7 (below).

vavarṣa ṣaravarṣeṇa dhārābhir iva toyadaḥ, Mbh. vi. 58. 26.
dhārābhir iva toyadaḥ

pravavarṣa (enam . . . ṣaradhārābhīḥ), R. vi. 51. 96; 81. 24.
ṣaravarṣeṇa . . . pravṛṣṭāu toyadāu iva, R. vi. 55. 39.
garjantāu iva toyadāu, Mbh. ix. 55. 38.
garjanti na vrthā ṣurā nirjalā iva toyadāḥ, R. vi. 44. 6 (36. 73).

prajajvāla raṇe . . . vidhūma iva pāvakaḥ, Mbh. vi. 109. 35;
 117. 48.
ṣuṣubhe . . . vidhūma iva pāvakaḥ, R. vi. 67. 20.

jalam sūrya ivā 'ñṣubhīḥ, Mbh. vi. 109. 33.
megham sūrya ivā 'ñṣubhīḥ, R. vi. 18. 40.¹

vikīrṇā iva parvatāḥ, Mbh. vi. 116. 39.
vikīrṇa iva parvataḥ, R. vi. 28. 39.²

ṣakrāṣanīśamasparṣān . . . ṣarān, Mbh. vi. 108. 35.
ṣakrāṣanīśamasparṣāṇīḥ . . . ṣarāṇīḥ, R. vi. 68. 6.³

ṣarāir (aṣanīśmasparṣāis tathā) sarṣaviṣopamāṇīḥ, Mbh. vi.
 117. 22.
ṣarāḥ sarṣaviṣopamāḥ, R. vi. 67. 17.

(sāyakān) jvalitāṣviṣopamān, Mbh. vi. 100. 5.
ṣarān . . . āṣviṣopamān, R. vi. 67. 3; 68. 5.⁴
ṣarāir āṣviṣopamāṇīḥ, R. vi. 19. 26; 27. 15.

The common epithet (vi. 30. 27; 73. 35; 74. 16, etc.), *agniṣikhopamāṇīḥ (ṣarāṇīḥ)*, of the Rāmāyaṇa is apparently lacking in the Mahābhārata. It is sometimes found in juxtaposition with the older form, as in R. vi. 55. 45, 52: *ṣaram āṣviṣopamam . . . ṣarān agniṣikhopamān*. R. vi. 36. 110 has *ṣarāṇīḥ kālānalaṣi-*

¹ In Mbh., *teṣām ādatta tejānsi*; in R., *nirbibheda ṣarāis tīkṣṇāṇīḥ*.

² In Mbh., *virejūḥ*; in R., *pāpāta sahasā*.

³ Variations of this formula are found in both epics. I note a few of them: *vajrasaṇīśmasparṣamān ṣarān*, R. vi. 70. 15; *ṣakrāṣanīśmasvanam*, Mbh. vi. 44. 11; *indrāṣanīśmasvanam*, ib. 62. 61; *ṣakrāṣanīśvanam*, R. vi. 61. 1; *ṣakrāṣanīśmasparṣamāṇīḥ ṣarāṇīḥ*, ib. 68. 10.

⁴ Compare *āṣviṣopamāṇīḥ ṣarān*, R. vi. 55. 37; *āṣviṣābhāṇīḥ*, Mbh. vii. 200. 76; *āṣviṣākārāṇīḥ*, R. vi. 74. 17; *sarpān iva mahāviṣān*, ib. 68. 5; and Mbh. vi. 49. 50, *ahīn āṣviṣān iva*; so 59. 20.

khopamāiḥ; ib. iii. 69. 19, *kālānalasamasparṣāṇiḥ*, like *ṣaram* . . . *āṣṭvīṣasamasparṣaṇi*, ib. vi. 70. 32, and the examples in *sama-sparṣa* above.

Another favorite of both epics is found in the phrase

ṣakraṣambharayor iva, R. vi. 55. 72.

yathā yuddhe . . . *ṣakraṣambharayoḥ purā*, Mbh. vi. 100. 54.

yuddhaṁ vṛtravāsavayor iva, Mbh. vi. 100. 51; R. vi. 79. 58.

Compare also (with the verse given by Jacobi, p. 74) Mbh. ix. 55. 31: *ubhāu sadṛṣakarmāṇāu* . . . *rāmarāvaṇayoḥ cāi 'va vālisu-grīvayos tathā* (in 28, *mayavāsavayor iva*; in 29 as above, with *Vaiçravaṇa* for *Rāvaṇa*).

But the *kiñçuka* simile is perhaps the commonest example of identical phraseology in this category:

praphulla iva kiñçukaḥ, Mbh. v. 179. 31 (*babhāu rāmaḥ*).

praphulla iva kiñçukaḥ, R. vi. 68. 20.

(*prakāṣete*) *puṣpītāv iva kiñçukāu*, R. vi. 20. 10; 32. 33; 70. 11.

(*ṣuṣubhāte*) *puṣpītāv iva kiñçukāu*, Mbh. vi. 45. 14.¹

Apart from these resemblances there are others, which consist in general content, such as the frequent lists of arms, noises, and number of arrows shot; the *kecit kecit* passages of Mbh. vi. 46. 4 ff. parallel to such scenes in R. vi. 28. 21 ff.; 32. 8; 59. 10 ff.; and the didactic literature, of which I have given a specimen at the beginning of this paper. Mbh. xiii. 88. 14 has as one half verse: *eṣṭavyā bahavaḥ putrā yady eko 'pi Gayāṁ vrajet*. R. ii. 115. 13 divides these *pādas*, inserting a whole elongating hemistich between them. Before this in R. stands, vs. 12, *punnāmno narakād yasmāt*, etc., and the same old pun is found in exactly the same words in Mbh. i. 74. 39, not to speak of legal literature. A more general resemblance is given by the similar diatribes in Mbh. iii. 30 and R. vi. 62 (where the proverb in vs. 30, *grīṣme kusarito yathā*, is attributed in PW. s. *kusarīt* only to *Pañcat.*).

But the most remarkable chapter of parallels in didacticism is to be seen in the *kaccit* sections of the two epics; for not only is the whole chapter in each epic practically the same, but a strict

¹ R. vi. 32. 25; 54. 24, etc., has *puṣpītāir iva kiñçukāiḥ*. Mbh. has *vyarājata raṇe* . . . *kiñçukaḥ puṣpavān iva*, vi. 110. 36. R. again has *puṣpītāv iva niṣpa-trāu yathā ṣālmalikīñçukāu*, vi. 68. 31.

comparison shows that in several instances the Bombay text of the Rāmāyaṇa agrees more closely with the text of the Mahābhārata than it does with the Gorresio text of the Rāmāyaṇa. The Gorresio text, too, is here the older.¹ The extent and variety of verses thus obtruded into both texts are of sufficient interest to call for a close examination.

The sections are Mbh. ii. 5; R. B. ii. 109 = C. 100. Mbh., vs. 36 = B. 52 and C. 53; but C., the Bombay text, alone is really the same with Mbh.

Mbh., *kaccid durgāṇi sarvāṇi dhanadhānyāyudhodakāiḥ*

R. C., " " " " "

R. B., *kaccit sadā te durgāṇi dhanadhānyodakāyudhāiḥ*

The verse preceding this in Mbh. has *kaccit sahasrāir mūrkhānām ekaṁ kṛmāsi paṇḍitam Paṇḍito hy arthakṛcchreṣu kuryān niḥṣreyasaṁ param.* R. B. has here, vs. 17, *mūrkhasaahasreṇa*, while C. 22 has the Mbh. reading, but also *icchasi* against *kṛmāsi* of Mbh., R. B. B.'s reading of the last *pāda*, however, is *brūyāt niḥṣreyasaṁ vacaḥ*, while that of C. is *kuryāt . . mahat.* The reading of Mbh. and R. C. reappears in the added verse 18 = 23 of R. in B.'s version, which is not found in Mbh. In Mbh. 37 = B. 19 = C. 24 the slight v. l. *dakṣo* makes Mbh. coincide with B. as against C. R.'s order is here better than that of Mbh. In Mbh. 39 = B. 46 = C. 37 the two halves of B. find parallels in Mbh. and C. respectively. As this verse in its three forms offers a good illustration of the plastic epic style, I will give them all:

R. B. a: *kaccit tvaiṁ dviṣatām arthaḥ pratipannaḥ ca sarvaḥ*

Mbh. a: *kaccid dviṣām aviditaḥ pratipannaḥ ca sarvadā*

R. C. a: *kaccid vyapāstān ahitān pratiyātāṅḥ ṣa sarvadā*

R. B. b: *sudurbalāṅḥ ca dhārayan vartase rīpūsūdana*

R. C. b: *durbalān anavajñāya* " "

Mbh. b: *nītyayukto rīpūn sarvān vīkṣase* "

In Mbh. *pratiyattaḥ* is an alternative reading. The agreement in Mbh. 41 = B. 8 = C. 12 is stricter with C. than with B., *vidhijñō* in Mbh. and C., *brāhmaṇo* in B. A conglomerate mixture of readings is presented in Mbh. 43 = B. 20 = C. 25, *pādas* 2 and 3

¹ Compare herewith Professor Jacobi's remarks on the parallels in the Rāma episode, loc. cit., top of p. 74.

being all alike, while 1 is the same only in Mbh. and C., and 4 is different in each of the three texts: *tāta niyojitāḥ* in B.; *te tāta yojitāḥ* in C.; *karmasu yojitāḥ* in Mbh. The following verse of Mbh. agrees with the order of C. 26 (= Mbh. 43, third and fourth hemistich); in B. transposed to 32.

Very interesting is the omission in B. of the verse Mbh. 44 = C. 27, for the former ends in *Bharatarṣabha*, and the latter in *Kāikeyīsuta*.

Mbh. 45 = C. 28 = B. 36; Mbh. and C. agree in order as against B.

Mbh. 46 = C. 30 = B. 40; slight v. l. unites Mbh. C. against B.

Mbh. 47 = C. 31 = B. 39; all vary slightly.

Mbh. 48 = C. 32 = B. 41; slight v. l. unites Mbh. B. against C.

Mbh. 49 = C. 33 = B. 42; v. l. unites B. C. against Mbh.

Mbh. 50 = C. 34 = B. 43 contains a jumble, where Mbh. and C. are twice united against B., thus: Mbh. and C. have *kaccit sarve 'nuraktās tvām*; B. has *kaccit pūrvānuraktās te*; Mbh. and C. have *kaccit prāṇāns tavā 'rtheṣu*; B. has *āhaveṣu priyān prāṇān*. R. in B. and C. has *samāhitāḥ* against Mbh. *sadā yudhi*.

The Rāmāyaṇa section is shorter than that of the Mahābhārata, which has many additions. Passing over twenty verses, Mbh. 70 resembles C. 54 = B. 53, but only in general thought (made more precise in Mbh.), and Mbh. 75 suggests C. 57 = B. 56. Thus, in the first case, R.'s *āyas te vipulāḥ kaccit kaccid alpātaro vyayaḥ* appears in Mbh. as *kaccid āyasya cā 'rdhena caturbhāgena vā punaḥ Pādabhāgāis tribhis vā 'pi vyayaḥ saṃśrudhyate tava*. Noticeable is the absence in R. of Mbh. 72, where are mentioned the royal *gaṇakalekhakāḥ*.¹ The agricultural care of Mbh. 76, *kṛṣṇvalāḥ*, receives attention in R. in other sentences, C. 43 b, ff. = B. 21 ff. At the end of Mbh. 77 appears *na kṛṣīr devamātrkā* = C. 45 (with v. l.), B. 23, beginning *adevamātrkāḥ kaccit*. The subject, more fully treated in Mbh., is left in B. with the awkward hemistich 24 b, *vārtāyām saṁsthitā tāta loko hi kṛṣijīvanāḥ*. This hemistich in Mbh. appears in 79 as *vārtāyām saṁśritas tāta loko 'yaṁ sukham edhate*, identical with C. 47 (v. l. *sāmpratam*).

Mbh. 85-86 are an expansion of C. 51 = B. 50, but the verbal resemblance in *samalaṁkṛtān* is confined to B. The resem-

¹ So Mbh.'s verse 42, containing the *jyotiṣaḥ pratipādakaḥ* and omen-knower, is an expansion.

blances between Mbh. and B. are in general of this character, slighter than those between Mbh. and C. and less frequent.

The original Niti is now almost ended and in the finale lies pretty plain evidence that C. and Mbh. are both expanded beyond the original limit kept in B. The text of Mbh. itself shows by the interpolation of a question and renewal of the theme afterwards that it originally stopped at vs. 110, which is where R. stops now according to B., the closing verses of B. corresponding to Mbh. 107-109. The correspondence here begins by being close, but then it lessens, and finally the "twelve vices" of B. are raised to "fourteen vices" in C. and Mbh. The construction, too, of C. is that of Mbh. (acc.), not that of B.

The questions thus added in Mbh. take up the neglected subject of foreign traders, *tantra* or treatises on agriculture; the knowledge of various Sūtras on military affairs; the use of magic, *brahmadanḍa* (= *ābhicārikavidyā*); the application of poison; the protection of *pravrajitās*; and an entirely new group of vices. C. 68 also adds a list of groups in verses which have a slight connection with the addition in Mbh. (compare Mbh. 21-23, an introductory list); and then C., in 72, = Mbh. 110, gives the verse which suggests Yudhiṣṭhira's question of interpretation and leads up to the appended duties. Just before this, C. 70, *yātrā-danḍavidhānaṁ ca dvīyonī sandhivigrahāu kaccid etān mahā-prājña yathāvad anumanyase*, doubtless goes back to the original of Mbh. 25, *kaccit saṁdhiṁ yathā kālaṁ vigrahaṁ co 'pasevase*. C. 73 = Mbh. 102.

Among the fourteen extra verses in C. there are, besides frequent cases of special resemblance, three, 27, 72, and 73 (and 70 may be added for the content), which are in Mbh. but not in B. On the other hand, of the six and a half verses that are in B. but not in C., none is found in Mbh. except 46 a, which may be a varied reading. Thus, B. 28, 31, 33-35, 37 fail in C. and in Mbh. alike. This points to a nearer connection on the part of the Mbh. text with the Bombay text than with the Gorresio text—an indication confirmed by the closing verses of the section; for, not to speak of the extent in Mbh. C., the fact that B. has twelve and Mbh. C. fourteen vices joins the two latter very closely and at the same time proves the priority of B., since no text would reduce a scheduled list of fourteen to twelve. Mbh. cannot, however, have copied either B. or C., as it agrees with each in turn, though, as I have shown, more decidedly with C., and it

must be remembered that B. and C., in respect of the number of verses and arrangement, are much more homogeneous as a whole than are Mbh. and C. In both epics the chapter is of course a late intrusion.¹

I need scarcely point out how clearly the *kaccit-sarga* shows the method by which an epic may be turned gradually into a text-book of morality. The Rāmāyaṇa is here entering on the path into which and along which the Mahābhārata was dragged, and its *kaccit* chapter furnishes by analogy a useful corrective to the superficial theory that the Mahābhārata was never an epic because it is now stuffed with maxims.

In a subsequent paper I hope to point out more of these epic parallels, and at the same time to discuss more fully the varied readings in the Rāmāyaṇa passages, as some of these readings seem to link one text more closely than the other with the Mahābhārata. But there is, I may say here, no uniformity in this regard, and moreover, so far as *iterata* are concerned, although a given formula of the Mahābhārata may occur in only one text of the corresponding passage of the Rāmāyaṇa, it is almost always found in some other passage of the alternate text.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

¹ The Calcutta text of the chapter in the Mahābhārata contains no important variations. The section was apparently inserted into the great epic after it had found a place in the Rāmāyaṇa, to judge by the uniformity of the former texts and dissimilarity of the latter.